

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/553,094	ANDERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marjorie A. Moran	1631	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Marjorie A. Moran. (3) _____
 (2) Chris Jeffers. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 15 January 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

- i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

MG Moran
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Jeffers pointed out that the office action of 11/23/01 recites rejections over SEQ ID NO: 7, but that SEQ ID NO: 1 was elected in the response of 8/27/01. The examiner replied that the record and her notes indicate that SEQ ID NO: 1 was searched and examined, therefore the recitation of SEQ ID NO: 7 appears to be a typographical error. The examiner stated that she would mail a supplemental office action reciting SEQ ID NO: 1, and would restart the time period for response.